

# STABILITY AND COERCIVITY FOR TORIC POLARIZATIONS

TOMOYUKI HISAMOTO

ABSTRACT. The purpose of this note is to explain that a toric polarized manifold is uniformly K-stable in the toric sense if and only if the K-energy functional is coercive modulo the maximal torus action.

## CONTENTS

|                                          |    |
|------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction                             | 1  |
| 1. Preliminary toric materials           | 3  |
| 2. Stability to Coercivity               | 5  |
| 3. Argument of Hilbert-Mumford criterion | 7  |
| References                               | 13 |

## INTRODUCTION

The idea of *uniform K-stability* was first introduced by the thesis [Szé06] and developed as it can be seen in [Der14a], [Der14b], [BBJ15], [BHJ15], [DR15], [BHJ16], and [BDL16]. Especially it was shown by [BDL16] that if the automorphism group is discrete, any polarized manifold  $(X, L)$  admitting a constant scalar curvature Kähler metric is uniformly K-stable.

In analytic point of view the counterpart of the uniform K-stability should be the coercivity property of the K-energy. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the collection of positively curved fiber metrics on  $L$  and denote by  $\varphi_g$  the pull-back of  $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$  by the bundle automorphism  $g \in \text{Aut}(X, L)$ .

**Definition.** Let  $G$  be a closed algebraic subgroup of the identity component  $\text{Aut}^0(X, L)$ . We say that K-energy functional  $M : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $G$ -coercive (with respect to Aubin's  $J$ -functional) if there exists a constant  $\delta, C \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  such that for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$

$$M(\varphi) \geq \delta \inf_{g \in G} J(\varphi_g) - C$$

holds.

This growth condition for the K-energy originates from Aubin's strong Moser-Trudinger inequality on the two-sphere. It assures the critical point in a certain completion of  $\mathcal{H}$  and in fact in the Fano case the obtained a priori singular metric defines a smooth

---

*Date:* October 26, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 53C55, Secondary: 14M25, 32Q20, 32Q26.

Kähler-Einstein metric (see [BBGZ13]). As well, the uniform estimate could help seeking a constant scalar curvature Kähler metric. See also [BBJ15].

This note is devoted to establish one expected correspondence between the stability and the coercivity, for toric polarized manifolds. Instead we restrict ourselves to the space of torus-invariant metrics  $\mathcal{H}^{\mathbb{S}}$  and toric test configurations, according to the symmetry of this class of manifolds. A toric test configuration is represented by a convex, rational piecewise-linear function  $f$  on the moment polytope  $P \subset M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Following [Don02] we define

$$L(f) := \int_{\partial P} f - \frac{\text{area}(\partial P)}{\text{vol}(P)} \int_P f. \quad (0.1)$$

In addition, let us introduce the J-norm as

$$\|f\|_J := \inf_{\ell} \left\{ \frac{1}{\text{vol}(P)} \int_P (f + \ell) - \min_P \{f + \ell\} \right\}, \quad (0.2)$$

where  $\ell$  runs through all the affine functions. This gives the toric correspondence of the non-Archimedean J-functional introduced in [BHJ15]. See Proposition 7.8 of [BHJ15].

**Main Theorem.** For any toric polarized manifold with the maximal torus  $\mathbb{T}$ , K-energy functional is  $\mathbb{T}$ -coercive on  $\mathcal{H}^{\mathbb{S}}$  if and only if there exists a constant  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$L(f) \geq \delta \|f\|_J \quad (0.3)$$

holds for any convex, rational piecewise-linear function  $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

We call the algebraic condition *uniform K-stability in the toric sense*. Whenever  $f$  is affine, the condition yields  $L(f) = 0$  hence it includes classical Futaki's obstruction. The proof of the coercivity is essentially due to [ZZ08b] where they adopt the larger “boundary norm” to measure the uniformity of stability. At the same time [ZZ08b], Theorem 0.2 assures a lot of example of uniformly K-stable toric polarizations. The converse implication needs a much newer argument, however, as the both proofs show our main declaration is that  $J$ -norm more naturally fits into the coercivity concept and it could work for general polarizations. In fact we derive the stability from  $\mathbb{T}$ -coercivity for general polarized manifolds. This is done by the slope of energy formula in [BHJ16] and the generalization of Hilbert-Mumford type argument to the stability of pairs, developed in [Paul12]. Lastly we refer the paper [CLS14] where they claim that a toric polarization with a constant scalar curvature Kähler metric satisfies our uniform K-stability. It combined with our result yields that  $\mathbb{T}$ -coercivity follows from the existence of a constant scalar curvature Kähler metric. In one conclusion the problem of finding a constant scalar curvature Kähler metric on a toric polarized manifold is reduced to the regularity of a weak solution.

**Acknowledgment.** The author would like to thank Professor S. Boucksom and M. Jonsson for fruitful discussions. He is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15H06262.

## 1. PRELIMINARY TORIC MATERIALS

We start from quickly reviewing the toric setting, as convenience for the readers. See [Gui94], [Abr98], [Don02], and [SZ12] for the detail. Let  $M$  be a integral lattice of rank  $n$ . A toric polarized manifold is defined by a Delzant polytope  $P$  in  $M_{\mathbb{R}} := M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ . In our notation  $P$  contains its boundary and we denote the interior by  $P^\circ$ . Let us denote the dual lattice by  $N$ . Then the complex torus  $\mathbb{T} := N \otimes \mathbb{C}^*$  naturally acts on  $X$ , having an open dense orbit. Notice that in the setting there exists a natural real form  $\mathbb{S} := N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{S}^1$ .

**1.1. Torus invariant metrics.** An arbitrary moment map  $\mu : X \rightarrow M_{\mathbb{R}}$  gives a homeomorphism  $\mu^{-1}(P^\circ) \simeq \mathbb{S} \times P^\circ$  so that  $N_{\mathbb{R}} \times P^\circ$  gives the universal cover of  $X_0 := \mu^{-1}(P^\circ)$ . In a fixed coordinate  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  we have the complex coordinate  $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$  of  $X_0 \simeq (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$  such that  $\log z_i =: \xi_i + \sqrt{-1}\eta_i$  defines the dual coordinate  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  of  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Then the Kähler metric defining  $\mu$  is written in  $X_0$  as

$$\omega = \sum dx_i \wedge d\eta_i.$$

Any  $\mathbb{S}$ -invariant Kähler metric  $\omega_\varphi = dd^c \varphi$  is represented by the local potential  $\varphi$  on  $X_0$ , which is a function in  $\xi_i$ . If one denotes it by  $\psi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$  the gradient

$$(z_1, \dots, z_n) \mapsto \left( \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_n} \right)$$

gives the moment map for  $\omega_\varphi$ . Notice that the image  $P$  is independent of the choice of moment maps.

The Legendre transform

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_1, \dots, x_n) &:= \sup \left\{ \sum x_i \xi_i - \psi(\xi) \right\} \\ &= \sum x_i \xi_i - \psi(\xi) \quad \text{when } x_i = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_i} \end{aligned}$$

is called the symplectic potential. By the standard Delzant construction, one can prove that  $u$  defines a convex function on  $P^\circ$  such that if  $P$  is written in the form

$$P = \{x \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \ell_k(x) := \langle x, \alpha_k \rangle - \beta_k \geq 0 \text{ for any } 1 \leq k \leq d\}, \quad (1.1)$$

then  $u - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d \ell_k \log \ell_k$  is smooth up to the boundary. Conversely, such a convex function defines an  $\mathbb{S}$ -invariant Kähler metric.

If one rescales  $u$  to  $u - \sum a_i x_i - b$  by an affine function,  $\psi$  changes into  $\psi(\xi_i + a_i) + b$ . In particular we can rescale  $u$  to have a point  $x^0 \in P^\circ$  as a minimizer. Then rescaling again by

$$\sum a_i x_i + b = \sum \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}(x^0)(x_i - x_i^0) + u(x^0)$$

one obtains the symplectic potential  $u$  satisfying

- (i)  $\inf_P u = u(x^0) = 0$  for some  $x^0 \in P^\circ$  and
- (ii)  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}(x^0) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

We say  $u$  is normalized at this end. Note that the change of variables  $\xi_i \mapsto \xi_i + a_i$  just corresponds to the  $\mathbb{T}$ -action.

The scalar curvature is given by a fourth-order differential of  $u$ .

**Theorem 1.1** (Abreu). *(i) Hessian is transformed as*

$$(u_{ij}) := \left( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right) = \left( \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \xi_i \partial \xi_j} \right)^{-1} \quad \text{when } x_i = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_i}.$$

*(ii) Denoting  $(u^{ij}) := (u_{ij})^{-1}$ , (twice of) the scalar curvature is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\omega_\varphi} &:= \frac{n \operatorname{Ric} \omega_\varphi \wedge \omega_\varphi^{n-1}}{\omega_\varphi^n} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 u^{ij}}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \quad \text{when } x_i = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \xi_i}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**1.2. Toric test configurations.** Let us continuously fix the coordinate of  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ . By the definition of moment map, Hamilton functions associated with the vector fields in  $N_{\mathbb{R}}$  are translated to affine functions on  $P$ . A general toric test configuration correspond to a convex, rational piecewise-linear function  $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . This is a torus-equivariant morphism  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(1))$  constructed by the big polytope

$$\mathfrak{P} := \{(u, \lambda) \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \times \mathbb{R} \mid f(u) \leq \lambda \leq \max_P f\}. \quad (1.2)$$

The corresponding toric polarization  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  in fact forms a  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -equivariant flat family of  $\mathbb{Q}$ -polarized schemes with  $(\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_0, \mathcal{L}) \simeq (X \times \mathbb{C}, p_1^* L)$  so that it give a test configuration in the terminology of [Don02]. Toric version of the Donaldson-Futaki invariant is given by the form

$$\cdot L(f) = \int_{\partial P} f - \hat{S} \int_P f \quad (1.3)$$

with the volume  $V = \operatorname{vol}(P)$  and the mean of the scalar curvature

$$\hat{S} = \frac{\operatorname{area}(\partial P)}{\operatorname{vol}(P)}. \quad (1.4)$$

The integration on  $P$  is for the Lebesgue measure of  $M_{\mathbb{R}} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$  and we adopt the area measure  $d\sigma$  on  $\partial P$  determined by

$$dx_1 \cdots dx_n = \pm d\sigma \wedge d\ell_k.$$

**Remark 1.2.** *The above  $L(f)$  is not precisely equivalent to the Donaldson-Futaki invariant introduced in [Don02]. Indeed  $L(f)$  is homogeneous with respect to the finite base change of the affine line but the Donaldson-Futaki invariant is not. It should corresponds to homogeneous non-Archimedean K-energy  $M^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  defined by 3.3. All these invariants are equivalent when the central fiber  $\mathcal{X}_0$  is reduced. See [BHJ15] for the detail.*

**1.3. Energy functionals.** Recall that classical K-energy  $M$  and the Aubin-Mabuchi energy  $E$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  are characterized by their differential:

$$\delta M(\varphi) = -\frac{1}{V} \int_X (\delta\varphi)(S_\varphi - \hat{S})\omega_\varphi^n/n! \quad \text{and} \quad (1.5)$$

$$\delta E(\varphi) = \frac{1}{V} \int_X (\delta\varphi)\omega_\varphi^n/n!. \quad (1.6)$$

As a scale-free version of  $E$ , we use Aubin's J-functional given by

$$J(\varphi) = \frac{1}{V} \int_X \varphi \omega^n/n! - E(\varphi), \quad (1.7)$$

where  $\omega$  is a reference metric to define  $E$ .

For a general polarized manifold  $V$  denotes the self-intersection number  $L^n$  and  $\hat{S}$  denotes the mean of the scalar curvature  $-\frac{n}{2}V^{-1}K_X L^{n-1}$ . Restricted to  $\mathbb{S}$ -invariant metrics these functionals have the following description on  $P$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $u$  be the symplectic potential of an  $\mathbb{S}$ -invariant Kähler metric  $\varphi$  on toric  $(X, L)$ . Then the energies are written in the forms*

(i)

$$VE(\varphi) = - \int_P u \quad \text{and} \quad (1.8)$$

(ii)

$$VM(\varphi) = - \int_P \log \det(u_{ij}) + \int_{\partial P} u - \hat{S} \int_P u. \quad (1.9)$$

It is remarkable in the toric case that the linear part is given by

$$L(u) = \int_{\partial P} u - \hat{S} \int_P u. \quad (1.10)$$

Abuse of notation we will write the energies like  $M(u)$  or  $J(u)$  as functions in  $u$ . For the  $J$ -functional we recall:

**Lemma 1.4** ([ZZ08b], Lemma 2.1). *There exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for any normalized symplectic potential  $u$*

$$\left| J(\varphi) - \frac{1}{V} \int_P u \right| \leq C.$$

□

## 2. STABILITY TO COERCIVITY

In this section we prove the half of the main theorem, from stability to coercivity direction. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the collection of convex functions with the growth condition:

$$u - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \ell_k \log \ell_k \in C^\infty(P).$$

By a standard approximation result (Proposition 5.2.8 and Corollary 5.2.5 of [Don02]), we may assume that  $L(u) \geq \delta \|u\|_J$  holds for any  $u \in \mathcal{S}$ . We also need the space  $\mathcal{C}_\infty$  which consists of continuous convex function smooth on  $P^\circ$ .

Fix  $u_0 \in \mathcal{S}$  to set

$$L_0(u) := \int_{\partial P} u - \int_P \left( -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 u_0^{ij}}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right) u \quad \text{and} \quad (2.1)$$

$$VM_0(u) := - \int_P \log \det(u_{ij}) + L_0(u). \quad (2.2)$$

The idea of the proof originates from the following lemma.

**Proposition 2.1** ([Don02], Proposition 3.3.4). *For any  $u \in \mathcal{C}_\infty$ ,  $M_0(u) \geq M_0(u_0)$  holds.*

If  $u \geq 0$ , it follows from Hölder's inequality that

$$|L(u) - L_0(u)| = \left| \int_P \left( \hat{S} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 u_0^{ij}}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right) u \right| \leq \frac{C}{V} \int_P u.$$

For an arbitrary  $u \in \mathcal{S}$  one can take any affine function  $\ell$  for which  $(u + \ell) - \min_P \{u + \ell\}$  is applied to the above inequality so that

$$|L(u) - L_0(u)| \leq C \|u\|_J$$

holds. Let us decompose like

$$\|u\|_J = (1 + k) \|u\|_J - k \|u\|_J$$

and bound the first term by  $L(u) \geq \delta \|u\|_J$ . This leads us

$$|L(u) - L_0(u)| \leq \delta^{-1} C (1 + k) L(u) - Ck \|u\|_J$$

to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} VM(u) &\geq - \int_P \log \det(u_{ij}) + \frac{1}{1 + \delta^{-1} C (1 + k)} L_0(u) + \frac{Ck}{1 + \delta^{-1} C (1 + k)} \|u\|_J \\ &= VM_0\left(\frac{u}{1 + \delta^{-1} C (1 + k)}\right) - n \log(1 + \delta^{-1} C (1 + k)) + \frac{Ck}{1 + \delta^{-1} C (1 + k)} \|u\|_J. \end{aligned}$$

Then the value of  $M_0$  in the first term is bounded from below by Proposition 2.1. Notice that as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  the coefficient of  $J$ -norm approaches to  $\delta$ . In particular for normalized  $u \in \mathcal{S}$  we obtain

$$M(u) \geq \delta' J(u) - C'$$

with effective  $\delta'$  and  $C'$ .

For any affine function  $\ell$ , the non-linear term of  $M(u + \ell)$  is the same as that of  $M(u)$ . It is equivalently to say

$$M(u + \ell) = M(u) + L(\ell). \quad (2.3)$$

The stability assumption yields  $L(\ell) \geq \|\ell\|_J = 0$  and  $L(-\ell) \geq 0$  since  $-\ell$  is also an affine function. Thus we conclude

$$M(u) \geq \delta' \inf_{\ell} J(u + \ell) - C'.$$

As we noted, adding an affine function corresponds to the  $\mathbb{T}$ -action so that we get  $\mathbb{T}$ -coercivity.  $\square$

To show the converse, it is natural to attach the “ray” emanating from  $u \in \mathcal{S}$ , to a convex  $f$ . For example this is given in [SZ12] by the form  $u + t\tilde{f}$  with  $\tilde{f} := f - \frac{1}{V} \int_P f$  and  $t \geq 0$ . Since the non-linear term of  $M(u + t\tilde{f})$  does not depend on  $t$  we expect the stability dividing the estimate

$$M(u + t\tilde{f}) \geq \delta \inf_{\ell} J(u + t\tilde{f} + \ell) - C \quad (2.4)$$

by  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . In fact the affine function  $\ell$  which attains the infimum depends on  $t$ . In the next section we will fix the problem by taking a natural filtration of  $\mathcal{H}$ .

### 3. ARGUMENT OF HILBERT-MUMFORD CRITERION

Let us now treat with a general complex polarized manifold  $(X, L)$ . In this section we would rather like to represent a test configuration by a one-parameter subgroup (1-PS for short). For an exponent  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  global sections  $H^0(X, L^{\otimes r})$  define the Kodaira embedding  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_r-1}$ . Any 1-PS  $\lambda : \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$  defines a test configuration as the Zariski closure

$$\mathcal{X}_\lambda := \overline{\bigcup_{\tau \in \mathbb{C}^*} (\lambda(\tau)X \times \{\tau\})} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{N_r-1} \times \mathbb{C}^* \quad (3.1)$$

with the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -line bundle  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda := \mathcal{O}(1/r)|_{\mathcal{X}}$ . By the equivariant version of Kodaira embedding one can prove that any test configuration is obtained in this way from some (not unique) 1-PS.

Let  $\mathbb{T} \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}^0(X, L)$  be a maximal torus. We say that a test configuration is  $\mathbb{T}$ -equivariant if it is endowed with a  $\mathbb{T}$ -action which preserves fiber, commutes the  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -action, and is compatible with the identification  $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{L}_1) \simeq (X, L)$ . For any representative 1-PS  $\lambda$  it is equivalent to say that  $\lambda$  is commutative with  $\mathbb{T}$ . In other words there exists a maximal torus  $D \subset \mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$  satisfying  $\lambda(\mathbb{C}^*) \subseteq D$  and  $\mathbb{T} \subseteq D$ . In case  $(X, L)$  is toric this is equivalent to give a toric test configuration. In fact  $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{C}^*$  acts on  $\mathcal{X}$  with the open dense orbit. Let us denote the space of 1-PS to  $D$  by  $N(D)$ .

A guideline for the stability from the coercivity should be the fact that the Donaldson-Futaki invariant of a test configuration is given by the slope of the K-energy along the associated ray  $\varphi^t$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  ( $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ). Actually in [BHJ15] the *non-Archimedean energy*  $M^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ ,  $J^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  of a test configuration, which is characterized by the property

$$M^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} M(\varphi^t)/t \quad \text{and} \quad J^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} J(\varphi^t)/t \quad (3.2)$$

were introduced. Here  $\varphi^t$  is a smooth ray on  $\mathcal{H}$  with appropriate compatibility with  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$ . For example one can take  $\varphi^t(x) := \Phi_{\mathrm{FS}}(\lambda(e^{-t})x, e^{-t})$ ; pull-back of the restriction

of some Fubini-Study metric in (3.1). The relation of  $M^{\text{NA}}$  and the Donaldson-Futaki invariant is given by the explicit form

$$\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = M^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) + ((\mathcal{X}_0 - \mathcal{X}_{0,\text{red}})\overline{\mathcal{L}}^n), \quad (3.3)$$

where the second term is the intersection of the non-reduced part of the central fiber and the extension of  $\mathcal{L}$  to the trivial compactification of  $\mathcal{X}$  (which is obtained by (1.2 for a toric test configuration). What we need in the sequel is a consequence that  $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) \geq M^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  and the equality holds if  $\mathcal{X}_0$  is reduced. Notice that in the toric case normality of  $\mathcal{X}_0$  implies  $\mathcal{X} \simeq X \times \mathbb{C}$  (see the proof of [DS15], Theorem 17).

At this point we assume the coercivity

$$M(\varphi^t) \geq \delta \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{T}} J(\varphi_\sigma^t) - C$$

to show the stability. The trouble here is of course that the element  $\sigma \in \mathbb{T}$  attaining the infimum of  $J(\varphi_\sigma^t)$  depends on the time parameter  $t$ . We go through the collection of all Fubini-Study fiber metrics for  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N_r-1}$  denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_r$  to avoid the point. Tian-Zeldich-Catlin's Bergman kernel asymptotic indicates us to exploit the space by showing  $\mathcal{H} = \bigcup_r \overline{\mathcal{H}_r}$ .

**3.1. Function of log-norm singularities.** We basically quote the formalism of [BHJ16]. In the sequel we fix a sufficiently large exponent  $r$  and some  $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_r$  to consider the functions in  $g \in \text{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$ :

$$m(g) := M(\varphi_g), \quad j(g) := J(\varphi_g), \quad (3.4)$$

and  $e(g) := E(\varphi_g)$  for the Aubin-Mabuchi energy  $E$ .

Let us start from the following which I learned from Professor S. Boucksom.

**Proposition 3.1.** *The energies  $e$  and  $m$  are pluriharmonic and  $j$  is plurisubharmonic along  $\text{Aut}^0(X, L)$ .*

*Proof.* Let us take an arbitrary holomorphic map from the one-dimensional open disk  $\Delta \rightarrow \text{Aut}^0(X, L)$  which sends  $z \in \Delta$  to  $g(z)$ . We have the well-known formula which gives the curvature by fiber integration:

$$dd_z^c E(\varphi_{g(z)}) = (n+1)^{-1} V^{-1} \int_X (dd_{z,x}^c \varphi_{g(z)}(x))^{n+1}.$$

Defining the holomorphic map  $F : \Delta \times X \rightarrow X$  by  $F(z, x) := g(z) \cdot x$  we may proceed as

$$\begin{aligned} (dd_{z,x}^c \varphi_{g(z)}(x))^{n+1} &= (dd_{z,x}^c F^* \varphi)^{n+1} \\ &= F^*(dd_x^c \varphi)^{n+1} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line vanishes for the big degree. This completes the proof for  $e$ . Plurisubharmonicity of  $j$  is immediate. Let us focus on  $M$ . We regard  $M$  as a metric on the Deligne pairing  $\langle K_{\Delta \times X/\Delta} \mathcal{L}^n \rangle + (n+1)^{-1} \hat{S} \langle \mathcal{L}^{n+1} \rangle$  with  $\mathcal{L} := F^* L$  (see *e.g.* [BHJ16]). such that the proof reduces to the equality

$$dd_{z,x}^c \langle \log(dd^c \varphi_{g(z)})^n, \varphi_{g(z)}, \dots, \varphi_{g(z)} \rangle = 0,$$

where the Monge-Ampère operator is taken over  $X$ . Set  $\Psi := \log(dd^c \varphi_{g(z)})^n$  as a metric on  $K_{\Delta \times X/\Delta}$  and  $\psi := \log(dd^c \varphi)^n$  as a metric on  $K_X$ . Since the natural automorphism

$G : (z, x) \mapsto (z, g(z) \cdot x)$  of  $\Delta \times X$  induces  $F^*K_X \simeq p_2^*K_X = K_{\Delta \times X/\Delta}$  we are led to show

$$F^*\psi = \Psi.$$

This can be checked fiberwisely. Indeed for each fixed  $z$  we have the inclusion  $i_z : X \rightarrow \Delta \times X$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\Psi_z} &= (dd^c i_z^* F^* \varphi)^n = V^{-1} i_z^* (dd_{z,x}^c F^* \varphi)^n \\ &= i_z^* F^* (dd^c \varphi)^n = g(z)^* (dd^c \varphi)^n. \end{aligned}$$

□

Plurisubharmonicity on  $GL(N_r, \mathbb{C})$  is not the case. A fundamental result of [Paul12] tells us that asymptotic of these functions are controlled by the difference of two plurisubharmic functions. More specifically it is described by the actions to two homogeneous polynomials;  $X$ -resultant  $R$  and  $X$ -hyperdiscriminant  $\Delta$  associated with the Kodaira embedding. To be precise, taking norms  $\|\cdot\|$  of  $GL(N_r; \mathbb{C})$ -vector space where  $R$  and  $\Delta$  lives and the Hilbert-Schmidt norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{HS}}$  of  $GL(N_r; \mathbb{C})$  we have

$$m(g) = V^{-1} \log \|g \cdot \Delta\| - V^{-1} \frac{\deg \Delta}{\deg R} \log \|g \cdot R\| + O(1) \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$j(g) = V^{-1} \log \|g\|_{\text{HS}} - V^{-1} \frac{1}{\deg R} \log \|g \cdot R\| + O(1). \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover the second term for  $j(g)$  just corresponds to the Aubin-Mabuchi functional. The point here is that we can not expect to have a single log-norm term as in the classical GIT setting. In the terminology of [BHJ16], for a general reductive group  $G$  a function  $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the form

$$f(g) = a \log \|g \cdot v\| - b \log \|g \cdot w\| + O(1)$$

is said to have log-norm singularities. Even in this generalized “pair of log-norm terms” setting, we have the correspondence of the Hilbert-Mumford weight for a given 1-PS.

**Theorem 3.2** (Theorem 4.4 of [BHJ16]). *Let  $f$  be a function on  $G$  with log norm singularities. Then,*

(i) *For each 1-PS  $\lambda : \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow G$  there exists  $f^{\text{NA}} \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that*

$$f(\lambda(\tau)) = f^{\text{NA}}(\lambda) \log |\tau|^{-1} + O(1)$$

*for  $|\tau| \leq 1$ .*

(ii)  *$f$  is bounded below on  $G$  iff  $f^{\text{NA}}(\lambda) \geq 0$  for all 1-PS  $\lambda$ .*

Applying the theorem to  $f(g) = M(\varphi_g)$  (resp.  $J(\varphi_g)$ ) with  $\varphi$  a Fubini-Study weight, one obtains  $f^{\text{NA}}(\lambda) = M^{\text{NA}}(\lambda)$  (resp.  $J^{\text{NA}}(\lambda)$ ). In the proof of the main theorem we like to study how the above  $O(1)$ -term is determined. For the reason let us go back to the construction of  $f^{\text{NA}}(\lambda)$ . As a standard fact of  $\mathbb{C}^*$ -representation any  $v \in V$  in the  $GL(N_r; \mathbb{C})$ -vector space has the decomposition

$$\lambda(\tau)v = \sum \tau^{\lambda_i} v_i \quad (3.7)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \|\lambda(\tau)v\| &= \max \{ \lambda_i \log |\tau| + \log \|v_i\| \} + O(1) \\ &= -\min \lambda_i \cdot \log |\tau|^{-1} + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

In the first line

$$\log \|\lambda(\tau)v\| \geq \max \{ \lambda_i \log |\tau| + \log \|v_i\| \}$$

is trivial and  $O(1)$  only depends on  $N_r$ . To investigate the second  $O(1)$  we take a maximal complex torus  $D \subseteq \mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$  which contains the image of  $\lambda$ . We denote the character space by  $M(D) := \mathrm{Hom}(D, \mathbb{C}^*) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^{N_r}$ . The dual space  $N(D) := \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^*, D)$  is naturally identified with the collection of one-parameter subgroups. Then any  $\mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$ -module  $V$  has the decomposition  $V = \bigoplus_{\chi} V_{\chi}$  such that  $d \cdot v = \chi(d)v$  for  $v \in V_{\chi}$ . Set the weight space of a given  $v \in V$  as

$$M_v := \{ \chi \in M \mid V_{\chi}\text{-component of } v \text{ is non-zero} \} \quad (3.8)$$

and denote its convex hull in  $M_{\mathbb{R}} := M \otimes \mathbb{R}$  by  $P_v$ . Define the characteristic function  $p_v(\chi)$  whose value is identically zero if  $\chi \in P_v$  and  $\infty$  otherwise. We set the Legendre transform of the convex function  $p_v$  as

$$h_v(\lambda) = \max_{\chi \in M_v} \langle \chi, \lambda \rangle \quad (3.9)$$

and call it the support function.

Next we fix any maximal compact group  $U \subset \mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$ . Notice that  $U$  ensures the following property.

- (i)  $D \cap U \subseteq U$  is a maximal real torus.
- (ii) Any two maximal tori  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are conjugate by an element of  $U$ .
- (iii) The Cartan(polar) decomposition  $\mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C}) = UDU$  holds.

From the property (i) we have  $\mathrm{Log} |\cdot| : D \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$  which yields  $D/(D \cap U) \simeq N_{\mathbb{R}}$ . One observes for any  $\chi \in M$   $\log |\chi(d)| = \langle \chi, \mathrm{Log} |d| \rangle$  and for any  $\lambda \in N$   $\mathrm{Log} |\lambda(\tau)| = \log |\tau| \cdot \lambda$  holds. In this setting we repeat the formula in [BHJ16] that for any  $u, u' \in U$  and  $d \in D$

$$f(u'du) = h_{u \cdot v_+}(\mathrm{Log} |d|) - h_{u \cdot v_-}(\mathrm{Log} |d|) + O(1) \quad (3.10)$$

holds and claim that  $O(1)$ -term is determined by  $U$  hence independent of  $D$ . We may assume that the norm is  $U$ -invariant so

$$\log \|(u'du)v\| = \log \|(du)v\| = \log \left\| \sum_{\chi \in M_{uv}} \chi(d)(uv)_{\chi} \right\|.$$

The last term is written to be

$$\max_{\chi \in M_{uv}} \log \{ \langle \chi, \mathrm{Log} |d| \rangle + \log \|(uv)_{\chi}\| \} + O(1)$$

with  $O(1)$  determined by the cardinality of  $M_{uv}$ . On the other hand compactness of  $U$  yields a constant  $C$  such that

$$-C \leq \log \|(uv)_{\chi}\| \leq C \quad (3.11)$$

for any  $u \in U$  and  $\chi \in M_{uv}$ . If we take another maximal torus  $D' = uDu^{-1}$  characters are naturally related in the manner

$$\chi \in M(D) \longleftrightarrow \chi' := \chi(u^{-1} \cdot u) \in M(D').$$

For  $v_\chi \in V_\chi$  and  $d' = udu^{-1}$  we have

$$d'(uv_\chi) = udv_\chi = u\chi(d)v_\chi.$$

The last one equals to  $\chi(d)(uv_\chi) = \chi'(d')(uv_\chi)$  by linearity, hence  $uv_\chi \in V_{\chi'}$ . It concludes that the multiplication  $v \mapsto uv$  is compatible to the weight decomposition in the sense that

$$(u \cdot v)_{\chi'} = u \cdot v_\chi$$

holds for  $v \in V$ . Therefore the bound in (3.11) is determined only by  $U$ . By the definition of  $h_{u \cdot v}$  we then obtain the formula (3.10) with the desired  $O(1)$ -term.

For a fixed maximal torus  $D$  any 1-PS  $\lambda : \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$  has its image in some  $D'$  which is conjugate to  $D$ . Finally we agree that  $O(1)$  of Theorem 3.2 is determined by a fixed maximal compact subgroup  $U$  of  $G = \mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$ .

**3.2. Completion of the proof of the main theorem.** Assume  $\mathbb{T}$ -coercivity, namely that

$$M(\varphi) \geq \delta \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{T}} J(\varphi_\sigma) - C$$

holds for any  $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathbb{S}}$ . Then

$$m(g) \geq \delta \inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{T}} j(\sigma g) - C \quad (3.12)$$

for any  $g \in \mathrm{GL}(N_r; \mathbb{C})$ . Note that  $\varphi_g(x) = \varphi(g \cdot x)$  hence  $(\varphi_g)_\sigma = \varphi_{\sigma g}$ .

Let us take any  $\mathbb{T}$ -equivariant test configuration and its representative 1-PS  $\lambda \in N(D)$ . For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  set  $d_k := \lambda(e^{-k}) \in D$ . In a fixed coordinate,  $d_k$  can be written as a diagonal matrix  $(e^{-k\lambda_1}, \dots, e^{-k\lambda_{N_r}})$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  may be regarded as the collection of diagonal matrices the last  $n$  components of which are just 1  $\in \mathbb{C}^*$ . Then each infimum of  $j(\sigma d_k)$  is approximated by some  $\sigma_k := (e^{a_{1k}}, \dots, e^{a_{nk}}, 1, \dots, 1)$  with  $a_{ik} \in \mathbb{Q}$  so that

$$\inf_{\sigma \in \mathbb{T}} j(\sigma d_k) \geq j(\sigma_k d_k) - 1/k \quad (3.13)$$

holds. Set  $\mu_{ik} := -k^{-1}a_{ik} \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $q_k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $q_k \mu_{ik} \in \mathbb{Z}$  holds for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then  $\mu_{ik}$  defines  $\mu_k \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$  for which  $q_k \mu_k$  is a 1-PS. As a direct consequence of (3.2),  $M^{\mathrm{NA}}$  and  $J^{\mathrm{NA}}$  are homogeneous in  $\lambda \in N(D)$ . Therefore one can extend them to  $N_{\mathbb{Q}}(D)$  so that  $f^{\mathrm{NA}}(\lambda) = q^{-1} f^{\mathrm{NA}}(q\lambda)$  holds for  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ . In addition,  $\mu_k$  itself is not a 1-PS but some value *e.g.*

$$(\mu_k + \lambda)(e^{-k}) := (e^{-k(\mu_{1k} + \lambda_1)}, \dots, e^{-k(\mu_{nk} + \lambda_n)}, e^{-k\lambda_{n+1}}, \dots, e^{-k\lambda_N})$$

makes sense in  $\mathrm{GL}(N_r, \mathbb{C})$ . Noting these points the argument of subsection 3.1 can be applied to  $q_k(\mu_k + \lambda) \in N(D)$  and  $\tau := e^{-k/q_k}$  so that

$$j((\mu_k + \lambda)(e^{-k})) \geq J^{\mathrm{NA}}(\mu_k + \lambda) \cdot k + O(1) \quad (3.14)$$

holds with  $O(1)$  which is not only for  $k$  but also for  $\mu_k$  and  $\lambda$ . The right-hand side is obviously bounded from below by

$$\inf_{\mu \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})} J^{\text{NA}}(\mu + \lambda) \cdot k + O(1).$$

It follows that

$$m(\lambda(e^{-k}))/k \geq \delta \inf_{\mu \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})} J^{\text{NA}}(\mu + \lambda) + O(1/k). \quad (3.15)$$

Letting  $k \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain the stability:

$$M^{\text{NA}}(\lambda) \geq \delta \inf_{\mu \in N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})} J^{\text{NA}}(\mu + \lambda). \quad (3.16)$$

In the toric case  $N_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{T})$  consists of rational linear functions on  $M_{\mathbb{R}}$  so that we conclude the main theorem. □

**Remark 3.3.** *Note that  $\mathbb{T}$ -coercivity in particular implies  $m(g)$  bounded from below. Since Proposition 3.1 shows that  $m(g)$  is pluriharmonic on the quasi-projective variety  $\text{Aut}^0(X, L)$ , it is constant along the automorphism group. It follows from the slope formula (3.2) that  $\text{DF}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = M^{\text{NA}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L}) = 0$  if  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{L})$  is product.*

More generally one can consider a reductive subgroup  $G = K_{\mathbb{C}} \subseteq \text{Aut}^0(X, L)$  and the coercivity condition

$$M(\varphi) \geq \delta \inf_{g \in C(G)} J(\varphi_g) - C, \quad (3.17)$$

restricted to any  $K$ -invariant positively curved metrics. Note that  $\varphi_g$  is  $K$ -invariant for any  $g \in C(G)$ . From this coercivity, the above argument actually derives uniform  $K$ -stability relative to  $G$  in the sense of [His16].

## REFERENCES

- [Abr98] M. Abreu: *Kähler geometry of toric varieties and extremal metrics*. Internat. J. Math. **9** (1998), no. 6, 641–651. 3
- [BBGZ13] R. J. Berman, S. Boucksom, V. Guedj, and A. Zeriahi: *A variational approach to complex Monge-Ampère equations*. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **117** (2013), 179–245. 2
- [BBJ15] R. J. Berman, S. Boucksom, and M. Jonsson: *A variational approach to the Yau-Tian-Donaldson conjecture*. [arXiv:1509.04561](#). 1, 2
- [BDL16] R. J. Berman, T. Darvas, and C. H. Lu: *Regularity of weak minimizers of the K-energy and applications to properness and K-stability*. [arXiv:1602.03114](#). 1
- [BHI15] S. Boucksom T. Hisamoto and M. Jonsson: *Uniform K-stability, Duistermaat-Heckman measures and singularities of pairs*. [arXiv:1504.06568](#). 1, 2, 4, 7
- [BHI16] S. Boucksom T. Hisamoto and M. Jonsson: *Uniform K-stability and asymptotics of energy functionals in Kähler geometry*. [arXiv:1603.01026](#). 1, 2, 8, 9, 10
- [CLS14] B. Chen, A. M. Li, and S. Sheng: *Uniform K-stability for extremal metrics on toric varieties*. J. Differential Equations **257** (2014), 1487–1500. 2
- [DR15] T. Darvas and Y. A. Rubinstein: *Tian’s properness conjectures and Finsler geometry of the space of Kähler metrics*. [arXiv:1506.07129](#). 1
- [DS15] V. Datar and G. Székelyhidi: *Kähler-Einstein metrics along the smooth continuity method*. [arXiv:1506.07495](#). 8
- [Der14a] R. Dervan: *Uniform stability of twisted constant scalar curvature Kähler metrics*. [arXiv:1412.0648](#). To appear in Int. Math. Res. Notices. 1
- [Der14b] R. Dervan: *Alpha invariants and coercivity of the Mabuchi functional on Fano manifolds*. Int. Math. Res. Notices **26** (2015), 7162–7189. 1
- [Don02] S. K. Donaldson: *Scalar curvature and stability of toric varieties*. J. Differential Geom. **62** (2002), no. 2, 289–349. 2, 3, 4, 6
- [Gui94] V. Guillemin: *Moment maps and combinatorial invariants of Hamiltonian  $T^n$ -spaces*. Birkhäuser Boston, 1994. ISBN: 0-8176-3770-2. 3
- [His16] T. Hisamoto: *Orthogonal projection of a test configuration to vector fields*. [arXiv:1610.07158](#). 12
- [Paul12] S. T. Paul: *Hyperdiscriminant polytopes, Chow polytopes, and Mabuchi energy asymptotics*. Ann. of Math. (2) **175** (2012), no. 1, 255–296. 2, 9
- [Paul13] S. T. Paul: *Stable Pairs and Coercive Estimates for The Mabuchi Functional*. [arXiv:1308.4377](#).
- [SZ12] J. Song and S. Zelditch: *Test configurations, large deviations and geodesic rays on toric varieties*. Adv. Math. **229** (2012), no. 4, 2338–2378. 3, 7
- [Szé06] G. Székelyhidi: *Extremal metrics and K-stability*. [arXiv:0611002](#). Ph.D Thesis. 1
- [WN10] D. Witt Nyström: *Test configurations and Okounkov bodies*. Compositio Math. **148** (2012), 1736–1756.
- [ZZ08a] B. Zhou and X. Zhu: *K-stability on toric manifolds*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (2008), no. 9, 3301–3307.
- [ZZ08b] B. Zhou and X. Zhu: *Relative K-stability and modified K-energy on toric manifolds*. Adv. in Math. **219** (2008), 1327–1362. 2, 5

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, FUROCHO, CHIKUSA, NAGOYA, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* hisamoto@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp